

JAINA NARRATIVE LITERATURE AND ART

Jaina literature, canonical as well as non-canonical, and especially the narrative or *Kathā*-literature, in Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa or old Gujarati, Kannada, etc., contains a rich mine of references regarding arts and crafts, and various other aspects of the life of contemporary society to an extent not easily available in other branches of Indian literature. Jagdish Chandra Jain's famous work on *Life in Ancient India as depicted in the Jain Canons*¹, has ably demonstrated the importance of Jaina canonical literature in reconstructing the history of ancient Indian material culture. Sandesara pointed out some of the cultural data in the *Vasudevahiṇḍī*², a work of circa fourth century A.D., based upon the lost *Brhatkathā* of Guṇādhya, and falling into the category of narrative or *Kathā*-literature. Moti Chandra wrote on the *Architectural Data in the Rāyapaseṇaiya sutta*³, a canonical work, and U. P. Shah, in his *Studies in Jaina Art*⁴ and other papers, discussed relevant data from Jaina Canonical, cosmographical and other texts, including some of the Jaina *Purāṇas*. The Jaina *Purāṇa* literature would also serve as narrative literature along with some theological texts like the *Upadeśamālā* commentaries, etc. In an article, entitled *Caṭṭanām Maḍham - A gleaning from the Kuvalayamālā Kathā*, U. P. Shah pointed out the valuable description of a contemporary big Maṭha (*maḍham*), a sort of residential University or college in the Vijayapuri, probably situated in Kerala⁵. Gustav Roth utilised the art data in the *Rāyapaseṇaiya* etc. in his paper

1. J. C. JAIN, *Life in Ancient India as depicted in the Jain Canons*, Bombay, 1947.

2. B. J. SANDESARA, *Cultural Data in the Vasudevahiṇḍī*, in JOIB, 10 (1961). pp. 7-17.

3. MOTI CHANDRA, *Architectural Data in the Jain Canonical Literature*, in JUPHS, 22 (1949), pp. 64-80.

4. U. P. SHAH, *Studies in Jaina Art*, Banaras, 1955 (Jaina Cultural Research Society VIII). Cf. JYOTI PRASAD JAIN, *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India*, Delhi, 1964.

5. Published in ABORI, « Golden Jubilee Volume » (1968), pp. 247 ff.

on *The Woman and Tree Motif - Śālabhanjikā*⁶. He also pointed out this importance of the Jaina literature in a paper, *What the Jaina Sources can teach us*⁷. The importance of the Jaina *Kathā*-literature can never be overestimated by a student of the cultural history of India. This is amply demonstrated in K. K. Handiqui's *Critical Study of the Yaśastilaka-Campū*⁸, composed in 959 A.D. by Somadeva.

The *Angaviṣṭā*⁹, an early Prakrit text of about the fourth century A.D., is a work on omens and divination. But very few works in Indian literature can compete with it as a source of information regarding the various aspects of the life of contemporary Indian society.

A few references to art evidence, gleaned from Jaina narrative literature, are detailed here, just to demonstrate the value of Jaina narrative literature for students of Indian art.

Nemicandra sūri composed an *Ākhyānakamanikośa*, the treasure-house of jewels of stories, between c. 1073 and 1083 A.D., in only 53 verses, but in 1134 A.D., Āmaradeva sūri completed his big *Vṛtti* of 14000 granthas, on the above work, in the city of Dhavalakka-pura, modern Dholka in Gujarat, elaborately giving the stories referred to in the main work. The commentator was thus contemporary of ācārya Hemacandra. A few references from AMKV may be noted here¹⁰.

Amongst the various *vinodas* (pastimes) of the prince Meghaku-māra¹¹, one finds arts like *naṭṭa-vihi* (dance-drama), *cittayamma-vihi* (painting) and *gīya-vihi* (music, singing). Princes were trained in several sciences and arts, and it is said that they were given training in 72 arts, a stock list of which is known to different Jaina texts. We need not believe that in this period or in any other period the princes became trained in all the 72 arts, but we can presume that the princes took training in a few of them according to their taste and capacity. The training given to Naravāhana included training in arts like *gandharva-kālā* (music), *paṭṭaccheya*, *gandhānga-jutti* (perfumery), *cittayamma* (painting), etc.¹².

The royal palace (with its compound, etc.) was called *rāya-duvāra*, *rāya-kula*, *rāya-bhavaṇa*. The palace-royal or *prāsāda* had a harem (*an-*

6. Published in JASB(L), 23 (Calcutta, 1957), no. 1, « Meghnad Saha Number », pp. 91-116, plates I-VI.

7. Published in JOIB, 24 (1974), pp. 175-86.

8. K. K. HANDIQUI, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, Sholapur, 1949 (Jīvarāja Jain Granthamālā 2), reprint 1968.

9. *Angaviṣṭā* (Science of Divination through Physical Signs and Symbols), edited by Muni Śrī Puṇyaviṣṭayajī, Banaras, 1957 (Prakrit Text Society series I). Introduction pp. 35-55 by MOTI CHANDRA.

10. Cf. ĀCĀRYA NEMICANDRA's *Ākhyānakamanikośa*, with ĀC. ĀMRĀDEVA's commentary, edited by Muni Śrī Puṇyaviṣṭayajī, Varanasi, 1962 (Prakrit Text Society series 5). We will henceforth refer to the main work as AMK and to the commentary as AMKV (references are to page and verse of this edition).

11. AMKV 232, 126 ff.

12. AMKV 293, 126 ff.

teura), living halls and bed-chambers (*vāsa-bhavaṇa*) and an *atthāṇa-maṇḍava* or *rāya-atthāṇa* (or simply *atthāṇa*) which later was the audience-hall which could not be entered without permission of the king through the door-keeper. The bards chanted verses of praise of the ruler who visited it in the morning and the evening. Perhaps there were more than one *āsthāna-maṇḍapa*. In the *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa we hear about a *bhuktāsthāna-maṇḍapa*. The *āsthānamāṇḍapa* in the palace seems to be a hall or an open pavilion. In the temple built by Tejapala at Abu are two panels in one of the ceilings of the *bhamatī* showing scenes from the life of Kṛṣṇa at Gokula and Kāṁsa's palace¹³. Here we find a king sitting on a raised seat, in front of whom are attendants, warriors and others, some sitting, others standing. In the *AMKV* we are told that ministers, feudatories, warriors, leaders of citizens, guilds, etc. visited the *āsthānamāṇḍapa*.

The foreground or court-yard of a *rāja-sabhā* is said to have been adorned with pearls, etc. *rājasabhāe patto muttāmaṇimaṇḍie caukke*¹⁴. Another reference shows that square designs (*caukka*) of pearls were made on the ground, which reminds us of a Gujarati usage *motinā coka puravā*.

Kings had their special residential quarters (*dhavala-gṛha*) with apartments for queens (*anteura*). They had their halls for dressing (*siṅgāra-giha*) and the hall of mirrors (*āyariṣa-giha*). Sleeping chambers, royal or otherwise, were known as *vāsa-giha vāsa-bhavaṇa*.

Mattavāraṇa as a part of palace architecture could be well understood with the help of references in the *AMKV*. Rohiṇī, the wife of Dhanavāha Śreṣṭhī, was seen, by king Nanda, standing or sitting in the *mattavāraṇa* of her *dhavalaprāsāda*¹⁵. Madanasenā, queen of Makaradhvaṇa, sits in the *mattavāraṇa* of her palace with her husband and dresses the hair of the king¹⁶. Another queen goes stealthily at night into *mattavāraṇa* under which her paramour, the king's keeper of elephants, is waiting with the elephant. The elephant, goaded by the rider, raises its trunk and brings down the queen. It is, therefore, quite clear that *mattavāraṇa* is a balcony-like projection in front of a palace or a mansion in which queens or ladies of high families sat and was probably not far from ladies' apartment¹⁷.

Palaces had *vātāyaṇas* (windows), harems had *jāla-gavakkha*, latticed windows; an *oloyana* or a small window for looking out is also mentioned. A palace resting on one pillar. *pāsāyaṇ egaṭhambhaṇ*, is men-

13. MUNI SHRI JAYANTAVIJAYAJI, *Holy Abu*, translated from Gujarati by U.P. SHAH, Bhavnagar, 1954¹ (Shri Yashovijaya Jain Granthamālā), plate 38. For reference see KL. FISCHER, *Schöpfungen indischer Kunst*, Köln, 1959, no. 1346.

14. *AMKV* 42, 143.

15. *AMKV* 62, 20-26.

16. *AMKV* 200, 244.

17. See also U.P. SHAH's Introduction to *AMKV*, pp. 1-30; U.P. SHAH and B.J. SANDESARA, *A Further Note on Mattavāraṇa*, in *JOIB*, 10 (1961), pp. 438-41; M. A. DHAKY, *Mattavāraṇa in Vāstusāstra*, in *JOIB*, 16 (1966), pp. 70-8.

tioned¹⁸. A variously decorated (*cittarūva*) palace of lac (*jaupasāyaṃ pāhānakhambhajuyam*) is mentioned¹⁹.

In the *Kuvalayamālā*²⁰, composed in 779 A.D., by Uddyotana sūri, we find reference to *abbhaṃtarovatthāṇa-maṇḍava*, Hall of Private Audience, and a *bāhirovatthāṇa-maṇḍava*²¹. There is also a reference to *āpāṇaya-bhūmī* where the king took wines of various qualities, and a description of *aṇāha-maṇḍava*, or home for the poor and ill and mendicants, etc., in the city of Mathura²².

Elsewhere²³, *Kuvalayamālā*, describes a *citra-paṭa* depicting the *saṃsāra-cakra*, and then another painted scroll depicting *bhavāntaras* or various births. The first scroll, described elaborately, depicted the miseries, inequalities, futilities, etc., of human life, the condition of lower animals, etc., and of heavenly beings. The *saṃsāra-cakra* illustrated the three worlds of hell, human world and the world of gods. It may be noted that the *saṃsāra-cakra* was also painted by the Buddhists at Ajanta. It is stated in the *Divyāvadāna* that the *bhavacakra* was painted in the *dvāra-prakoṣṭha* or entrance of a palace²⁴. The long description of the scroll painting shows that painting on large scales, giving narration of stories through a chain of events depicted in succession, was practised. The whole account makes it quite clear that the efficiency of a painter lay in successfully depicting the different *rasas* (sentiments) and *bhāvas* (moods, passions) with clear outlines and appropriate use of pigments. Bhānu, the prince of Bārayāurī (Dvārikā-purī) in the Lāṭa-deśa, who was shown this *paṭa*, himself was a painter and knew appreciation of painting as well. It is said that he knew *citta-kamīna* which was accomplished with proper lines (*rekhā*), composition (*ṭhāṇa*), and portrayal of *bhāvas* with appropriate selection and application of colours (*varṇa*). The *citra-paṭa* looked as if it was a celestial painting, extraordinary, inspired; it very vividly represented all incidents, and it was *atisaṃkula*, i.e., crowded with a large number of figures, scenes, compositions, etc. Thus excellent workmanship lay in making the painting true to life, inspired and successful in the proper depiction of various scenes and figures on one canvass (*divva-lihiyayaṃ piva aisaṃkulam savva-vuttanta-paccakkhi-karaṇam*).

The *Samarāicca-kahā* speaks of a painting of *Vidyādhara-yugala* done with bright colours appropriately used (highlights), and made up of sharp fine lines drawn with very fine brush (*gulikā*). People also

18. AMKV 5, 35.

19. AMKV 331, 58.

20. I. Uddyotana Sūri's *Kuvalayamālā*..., critically edited... by A. N. Upadhye, Bombay, 1959 (Singhi Jain Series 45); II. *The Kuvalayamālā*. Introduction, notes etc... along with a Cultural Note on the *Kuvalayamālā* of Uddyotana by The Late Dr. V. S. AGRAWALA, 1969 (Singhi Jain Series 46).

21. *Kuvalayamālā* I, p. 9, § 20; 11, 15; cf. *Kuvalayamālā* II, p. 115.

22. *Kuvalayamālā* I, 20, 28; 55, 11 f.

23. *Ibid.*, 185, §§ 291 ss.

24. *Kuvalayamālā* II, p. 125.

excelled in portrait painting. The word used for lifelike portraits is *paḍicchandaya* (*praticchandaka*). In later texts we find the term *viddha-citra*, but it seems that in the days of Bhāsa, *praticchandaka* was used for portraits. Haribhadra sūri has used the term in this sense in his *Samarāiccakahā* ²⁵.

The act of painting was *ālekhana* or *lekhana*, as we also find in other texts like the *Pādatāḍṭitakam*. In *Samarāiccakahā*, chapter viii, we find that a portrait of a princess Ratnāvati was drawn on a canvass (*ālikhito abhimatapataḥ*). This was shown by the artists to a prince Guṇacandra who, on seeing it, remarks:

amhehi aditṭhauvvo annehi vi nūṇam ettha loehim /
evamviho surūvo rehānāso na diṭṭho tti //
jai vi ya rehānāso patteyaṃ hoi sundaro kaha vi /
taha vī samudayasohā na erisī hoi annassa // ²⁶

It will be seen that here while appreciating the portrait, emphasis is laid on the skill in drawing the outlines (*rekhā-nyāsa*). Did this emphasis on the line later develop into what we know as « linear conception » of painting, almost invariably seen in Western Indian miniatures?

Later, during the time of *citrakarma-vinoda*, Guṇacandra himself draws a painting of *Vidyādhara-yugala*. This is described as follows ²⁷:

ālikhitaḥ kumāreṇa suvibhaktōjjvalena varṇakarmanā-alakṣyamāṇair
gulikāvrajaṇir anurūpayā sūksmarekhayā prakāṭadarśanena nimnon-
nata vibhāgena viśuddhayā vartanayā ucitena bhūṣaṇakalāpena abhi-
navasnehotsukatvena parasparyaṃ hasyotphullabaddhadṛṣṭir ārūḍha-
prematvena langhitocitaniveśo (? lakṣitocitaniveśo?) Vidyādharasam-
ghāṭaka iti.

The pigments were properly mixed and the colours appropriately differentiated in various shades (*suvibhakta*) and were bright or showed proper highlights (*ujjvala*); the brushes (*gulikā-vraja*) were extremely fine (almost imperceptible) so as to draw very fine lines; the relieve was shown (heights and depths properly differentiated and suggested clearly), the *vartanā* or shading and modelling was *viśuddha*, i.e., faultless, the element of ornamentation (*bhūṣaṇā*) was appropriately introduced and the element of joy and affection towards each other (*bhāva*) properly executed.

Siddharṣi, another Jaina monk from Western India, who composed his allegorical story *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcakahā* ²⁸ towards the early tenth century A.D., uses almost the same terms in a passage quoted by C. Shivaramamurti in his *South Indian Paintings* ²⁹.

25. H. Jacobi, editor, *HARIBHADRA, Samarāicca Kahā*, A Jaina Prākṛta Work, vol. I: Text and Introduction (Calcutta, 1926) (Bibliotheca Indica, N.S. 139). *Samskṛta-chāyā-sahita*, in two parts, Ahmedabad, 1938, 1942. Further references in *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās*, bhāga 6, Vārāṇasī, 1973, p. 266, n. 1.

26. H. JACOBI, *op. cit.*, p. 608, lines 9-12; see also p. 623 ff.

27. I give here the Sanskrit chāyā of the passage: reference in n. 25.

The painting was drawn on a *paṭṭikā*, a wooden board. The two painters of the portrait of Ratnāvalī were asked by Guṇacandra to study and criticize the *citra-paṭṭikā* of *Vidyādhara-yugala*, executed by himself (Guṇacandra). The technical term used for art-criticism is *nirūpaṇa* (cf. *nirūveha tubbhe sayam eva ti* and *nirūvīya cittaṃ aibhusaṇehiṃ*). The *nirūpaṇa* of the *citra-paṭṭikā* done by the artists is noteworthy³⁰.

*Deva apūrvaiṣā citrakarmavicchittiḥ kathayatīva nijabhāvaṃ sphuṭa-vacanaiḥ citrakarmaṇi deva duṣkaraṃ bhāvārādhanaṃ praśaṃsanti idam evātrācāryāḥ abhinavasnehotsukenāpi paraspamaṃ hāsyotphul-ladrṣṭitvaṃ tathā-ārūḍhaprematvenāpi ca langi(kṣi)tocitaniveśakaṃ cātrakathitam api deva Citraśāstre paṭhyate, yathā vinā caritādinā adhikāreṇa yathā kathaṃcit kila yādṛśabhāvayuktaṃ citrakarma niṣpādyate tādṛśabhāvaniṣpattir niyamena citrakāriṇaḥ tato devasya priyadarśanena īdṛśo bhāva iti...*³¹.

It is just possible that here we have a quotation from a lost *Citraśāstra* in *vinā caritādinā... citrakāriṇaḥ*. It is important to note here that success in suggesting the *bhāvas* in a painting was regarded as a great accomplishment of the artist. The expression *citrakarmavicchittiḥ* is possibly used here in the sense of both proper arrangement (composition) and colouring with suitable pigments.

It is worth noting here an interesting reference to a *citraśālā* or Hall of paintings attached to the Jaina shrine Kumāravihāra at Pāṭaṇa, given by Rāmacandra sūri (the pupil of Hemacandrācārya and a contemporary of Kumārapāla who built the shrine) in his work entitled *Kumāravihāra-śataka*. Giving a poetic description of this *citraśālā*, he says that it had paintings of elephants, monkeys, camels, chariots, lives of gods and goddesses, scenes of several *Nāṭyas*, and of wars between gods and demons (*Kumāravihāra-śataka*, v. 110). At another place, paintings of horses, kalpa-vṛkṣas, Moon, Kāmadhenu, Lakṣmī, and the Airāvata elephant are referred to.

Paintings on walls of shrines and halls of paintings were common in Jaina shrines. Jinasena I (c. 830 A.D.) refers to a *paṭṭa-śālā* in a Jaina temple³². Earlier still, Jaṭāsīmhanandi (c. seventh century A.D.), in his beautiful work *Varāṅgacarita*, describing a Jaina temple, also refers to a *paṭṭaka-śālā*, in a Jaina shrine wherein were *paṭṭakās* (scrolls or boards

28. For references see M. WINTERNITZ, *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. II, Buddhist Literature and Jaina Literature (Calcutta, 1933), p. 525 ff.

29. C. SHIVARAMAMURTI, *South Indian Paintings*, National Museum (New Delhi, 1968), p. 27.

30. The Sanskrit *chāyā* is quoted here.

31. *Samarāṅgacakāḥ* pp. 749-50.

32. Cf. *Ādipurāṇa of Ācārya Jinasena*, edited by Pannālāl Jain, Varanasi, 1963² (Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jain Granthamālā, Sanskrit Grantha 8), part I: VI, 188.

or panels) with paintings of the lives of Tīrthaṅkaras, great monks, Cakravartins, and Vidyādhara³³.

Jaina shrines, *āyatana*s, *devakulas*, *bhavanas* or *caityas* and *caityālayas* are referred to in almost all the *Kathās* and *Purāṇas*. A shrine (*bhavaṇa*) of Śāntinātha, the sixteenth Tīrthaṅkara, is referred to in the *Padmacarita* of Raviṣeṇa³⁴ where it is said that the life of the Jina was painted (*svapnacitrārpitam*) on the walls of the first (*ādyā*) maṇḍapa. At XL 27 ff., we get a description of *caityas* of Jinās erected by Rāma. They had big pillars, *gavākṣas* (windows), *valabhīs*, big entrances with *torāṇas*, they had different *śālās*, were encircled by moats (*parikhā*), had white banners and were resonant with sound of big bells.

The *Varāṅgacarita* of Jaṭaśimhanandī (c. seventh century) describes a *caityagrha* erected at Ānartapura by Varāṅga³⁵. The long poetic description speaks of the temple having *gopura*, *aṭṭālaka*, very high *kūṭa*, having bells and garlands of pearls, having several *kūṭas* and rows of *harmyas*, beautiful lofty *śālās*. On the door was the goddess Śrī seated on the lotus, and on the sides were figures of Kinnaras, Bhūtas and Yakṣas. In the region of the entrance door (*kavāṭadeśa*), were figures of horses, elephants, chariots, lions and birds. The pillars were adorned with figures of *mīthunas* (*daṇḍpati*). There were *prekṣā-sabhās*, *abhiṣeka-śālā*, *āvādhyāya-śālā*, *sangītaka-śālā* and *paṭṭa-śālā*. On the outside of the shrine were step-wells, and a variety of trees.

The *Harivaṃśa* of Jināsena³⁶ describes in detail the *Samavasaraṇa* constructed by gods for the sermon of the Jina. The *Samavasaraṇa* is described in various texts, in the *Tiloyapaṇṇatti*³⁷, *Ādipurāṇa* of Jināsena, *Padmapurāṇa* of Raviṣeṇa, *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacarita* of Hemacandra³⁸ and so on. I have discussed the *Samavasaraṇa* in my *Studies in Jaina Art*³⁹. Some of the noteworthy elements of a *Samavasaraṇa* include the *stūpas*, and the *mānastambhas*, the *gandhakuṭī*, etc.

Images of Tīrthaṅkaras are referred to in most of the *Kathā* works. Moreover, these works refer to popular deities of other sects and folk cults, such as the Mahākāla at Ujjain, to temples of Kāma, Dhanadeva, to worship of Indra, Rudra, Skanda, Kātyāyanī, Mahiṣasuramardīnī, to

33. *Varāṅgacarita* XII, 67; 93, ed. A. N. Upadhye, Bombay, 1938 (Māṇika-candra Digambara Jaina Granthamālā). For reference see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās*, bhāga 6, Vārāṇasī, 1973, pp. 183-90.

34. *Padma Purāṇa of Raviṣeṇacārya*, ed. Pannālāl Jain, Varanasi, 1958-59, 3 vols. (Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā, Sanskrit Grantha 20, 24, 26), vol. III, LXXI, 42 ff.

35. XXII, 56 ff.

36. JINASENASŪRI, *Harivaṃśapurāṇam*, publisher N. Premī, 2 khaṇḍa, Bombay, 1930 (Māṇika-candra-Digambara-Granthamālā nos. 32, 33).

37. YATIVṚSHBHĀCĀRYA, *Tiloya-paṇṇatti*, bhāga 1 (chapters 1-4), bhāga 2 (chapters 5-9), editors A. N. Upadhye, Hīrālāl Jain, Sholapur, 1943 (1956²), 1951 (Jivarāja Jaina Granthamālā 1).

38. HEMACANDRA, *Triṣaṣṭiśālākā-puruṣa-caritra*, Jaina-Dharma-Prasāraka-Sabhā (Bhavnagar, 1905-9). English translation: HELEN M. JOHNSON, vols. I-VI, Baroda, 1931-62 (Gaekwad's Oriental series 51, 77, 108, 125, 139, 140).

39. Pp. 85-95 (reference in n. 4 of this article).

temples of Nāga, worship of Vāsudeva and so on. But the texts generally fail to give the iconography.

Jaina narrative literature however refers to the Jaina *aṣṭa-mangalas* and the *aṣṭa-mahā-prātihāryas* of a Jina, and sometimes poetically describe the ritual of the worship of the Jina in a shrine.

Descriptions of towns and cities are usually stock descriptions or traditional descriptions and have to be treated with caution before being accepted as contemporary evidence. The description, mixed with poetic fancy or exaggeration, is however, likely to have contained elements which persisted in town-planning from several centuries. For example, meeting of three roads (*trika*), four (*catuṣka*) or more than four, are often described, which is a common sight even to-day. Kauṭilya has referred to the existence of one or even three moats surrounding the fortification of a city. One moat (*parikhā*) was a common sight of most of the towns and cities even in the mediaeval period. The *Ādipurāṇa* of Jinasena⁴⁰ says that that city (*pura*) was praised, which was adorned with *parikhā*, *gopura*, *aṭṭāla*, *vapra* and *prākāra*, and various types of *bhavaṇas*, and had parks and reservoirs of water. In the same work, we have a general account of the Vidyādhara cities with three moats each. Measurements of moats, *gopura*, *aṭṭālaka*, *vapra*, *prākāra*, *indra-kośa*, etc. are given⁴¹.

M. R. Singh writes: «The fact that the traditional descriptions formed a major part of the *Kathā*-literature of the early mediaeval times has been aptly pointed out by Prof. G. C. Pande in his note on Uddyotana Sūri's *Kuvalayamālā*⁴². Hence a historian using the *Kathā*-literature as a source of information and considering it to be purely contemporary and empirical is likely to be misled because more often than not, a major part of the *Kathā*-literature happens to be a mere paraphrasing of older materials»⁴³. These remarks, even though they are welcome as a caution against indiscriminately using the cultural data of Jaina *Kathā*-literature, still should not detract us from utilising this very important source. A comparative study of the Jain *Kathās* and *Purāṇas* of various periods would at once show what is the traditional description and what is contemporary new evidence. And even in these traditional descriptions we cannot say that the whole data has not contemporary value, because in India traditions have persisted for a very long period. The lists of musical instruments obtained in these *Kathā* works would illustrate what I mean to convey here. The *Kuvalayamālā* again contains so much of contemporary data that, along with Bāṇa's, Haribhadra's works, the Cūrṇis, etc., it is a veritable mine of information for the life in India between the seventh and the eighth centuries A.D.

40. XVI, 169-70.

41. *Ibid.*, XIX, 52-71. M. R. SINGH, in an interesting paper entitled, *Jinasena's Portrait of a fortified City: A Critical Analysis*, published in «Jaina Art and Architecture» (Jaipur, 1980), pp. 53 ff., has critically compared this account with relevant passages from Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*.

42. M. R. SINGH, in *Jijñāsā*, 2500th Mahavira Anniversary Number (1974).

43. M. R. SINGH, *op. cit.*